

GRIFFITHS, (THOS. J.)

THOUGHTS ON HOMEOPATHY,

OR

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

BY

=✓

THOS. J. GRIFFITHS, M.D.

Member of several Homoeopathic Societies, &c.



LOUISVILLE, KY.
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

1852.

ALLOPATHIA, from the Greek “*allon*,” and “*pathos*,” means that medical system which makes other parts of the body suffer besides those affected by disease itself, for the sake of a cure, and which, in most cases, follows the maxim: “*contraria contrariis curantur*,” contrary cures contrary. We call it the old or common—practice,—school,—method,—doctrine, or Allopathic System.

HOMŒOPATHIA, from the Greek “*homoion*” and “*pathos*,” signifies the medical system, which does not attack the sound parts of the body to perform a cure, but uses medicines which directly operate on the parts affected, and which, tested by experience, produce, when given to a person in health, similar affections to the symptoms of the disease to be prescribed for. The fundamental principle of this system is: “*similia similibus curantur*,” like cures like. We name it the Homœopathic, reformed, new—system,—school,—doctrine,—method, or practice.

HOMŒOPATHY *versus* ALLOPATHIA.

Much has been written and published by the enemies of Homœopathy here and elsewhere, and still more in the form of denunciation has been spoken in the private circles of its enemies, until many unthinking minds are ready to believe the new system of medicine to be the very quintessence of quackery. Still, notwithstanding all the opposition of its enemies, it has steadily advanced in the estimation of the more intelligent portions of every community where it has been introduced, until it has spread over the entire Continent of Europe and Great Britain, and is sedulously and successfully practiced in every town of any magnitude in the United States, and in all the larger cities of the entire Western Continent.

The day has long since passed when denunciation and ridicule can produce any injurious effect upon the system which now includes among its warmest advocates nearly or quite an equal amount of talent, enterprise and scientific attainment with the old or Allopathic school. Thousands of the best minds and most eminent and successful practitioners of the latter school both in Europe and America have embraced the principles of the new and are now battling in the ranks of Homœopathy.

More than thirty Homœopathic physicians now hold the highest places of Honor as physicians to the Princes of the different States of Germany, Prussia and Austria. Professorships of Homœopathia are erected at Heidelberg, Vienna, Erlangen, Munich, Jeva, Leipsig, and numerous other cities both in England and upon the Continent, besides several in the United States, and several flourishing Colleges in Philadelphia, Cleveland, Chicago and other cities of the United States, where full and complete courses of instruction are given in all the departments of medical science. Hospitals have been founded in many of the principal cities of the World and Dispensaries are established at Palermo, Paris, London, Edinburg, Liverpool, Glasgow, New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, &c.

In all the cities of the United States where Homœopathy has been introduced, its advocates number among their patrons much the largest proportion of the intellectual and influential portions of community. The best half of the practice in New York, Philadelphia and Cincinnati is in the hands of Homœopathic physicians, and what is equally remarkable, not one of the thousands from the Allopathic schools who have given Homœopathy a careful investigation, and tested its superior claims by the administration of its remedies, has ever returned to the Allopathic ranks, and what is equally as true, where Homœopathy makes a convert from the families of the old school, it is seldom that they ever return. Hence often have we heard the remark by old school physicians when they have been compelled to *feel* and acknowledge the inroads made upon their practice, that "whenever Homœopathy makes a convert from our families, unlike *other species of quackery*, they never return to us again."



Such being the invariable result where Homœopathia has been introduced, and such the onward progressive march to popular favor of the once degraded system of medicine, that physicians now are seldom found denouncing the system as Empiricism but rather the mongrel practitioners who with but a superficial knowledge of any system are settling over the country like the locusts of Egypt. Allopathists pretend to respect those Homœopathists who honestly adhere to the principles of their art; but when Homœopathy shall be practised by greater numbers, as she will be; when her practitioners abandon entirely every Allopathic measure, and strictly adhere to the law of cure and the attenuated drugs, the mongrel and Allopathists proper will unite in opposition to genuine Homœopathy. This is not an unnatural supposition, because the ordinary Allopathic practice must be given up; it cannot be endured in this country ten years longer; it does not require an inspired prophet to foresee such a result. Allopathists everywhere are coming upon the ground of mongrels, although at present they pretend to despise them, but soon they will embrace each other. The signs of the times, we think, quite plainly indicate such a result. We have seen it repeatedly stated, that the law of cure is the chief or only thing in Homœopathy; that the small doses, the stumbling-block to physicians and laymen, are not an essential part of her. Now, why is this statement made and urged with so much earnestness as it has been by professed Homœopathists? The answer to this question is, to destroy confidence in those rules of practice which Hahnemann and his true disciples have tested by numerous and most careful experiments, and found them to be the most certain and safe of any yet known. These rules are disregarded by all mongrels, eclectics, and mis-named "rational Homœopathists," who, we should judge, desire to make the transition from the old school to the new, easy and pleasant, for they declare that a physician has only to profess faith in the law of cure, and he is a Homœopathist. Now, is it not plain, that inasmuch as the chief opposition to Homœopathy is directed against attenuated medicines and Hahnemann's rules of practice, that if these are abandoned, the door is opened to a mode of practice in the name of Homœopathy as pernicious as the purest Allopathy?

It is admitted on all hands, that Allopathists are gradually diminishing their doses of medicine, but are they more successful in the cure of diseases? They are not. Allopathists, by their diminished doses, are manufacturing chronic diseases by thousands, and mongrels, by their still smaller doses of crude drugs, often repeated with an occasional eye to the law of cure, are aiding them in the same destructive work.

There can be no middle ground between Allopathia and Homœopathia. If the former be true the latter must be false, and vice versa. But volumes might be filled recounting the testimony of Allopathic authors to the imperfection of their system and the *uncertainty* of their practice. Indeed, with them, there is no certainty. They cannot administer a single medicament with a certain knowledge of its effects,—while, on the contrary, a thousand Homœopathists would separately prescribe the same remedies for the same patient, and all predict the certain results or effects that would thereby be produced. With them, so far as their remedies have been carefully proved, all is certainty, with Allopathists nothing is certain. This may be illustrated by the daily occurrence of cures in inflammatory diseases (Pleuritis for

instance) which is daily cured in its worst forms by a few doses of Bryonia in decillionth attenuations, and often in a few minutes or a few hours at farthest; while Allopathia with its cupping, bleeding, purging, antiphlogistic treatment would require weeks or months to effect a cure, if, indeed, the patient escaped at all with his life.

For further proofs of the superiority of Homœopathia as a system, look at the statistics of their practice in many of the epidemics which have prevailed since Homœopathia was introduced.

The following *well authenticated reports* of the treatment of the Cholera in France on both the Allopathic and Homœopathic systems need no comments.

Treated Allopathically.

Number of cases treated, 495,027
Cured, 254,788
Died, 49 per cent.

Treated Homœopathically.

Number of cases treated, 2,239
Cured, 2,069
Died, 7½ per cent.

IN VIENNA.

Number of cases,
Cured,
Died, 31 per cent.

4,500
3,140
Number of cases,
Cured,
Died, 8 per cent.

AT BORDEAU.

Number of cases,
Cured,
Died, 67 per cent.

104
23
Number of cases,
Cured,
Died, 17 per cent.

EXTRACT FROM JOHN FORBES, M. D., F. R. S.,

One of the Editors of the "Cyclopædia of Practical Medicine," and Editor of the "British and Foreign Medical Review," &c.

The following extract shows the number and events of some of the more important and best marked diseases, treated by Homœopaths :

	Admitted.	Cured.		Admitted.	Cured.
Abscess of the brain	3	—	Meningitis	17	15
Apoplexy	9	4	Bronchitis	15	15
Cancer of stomach and uterus	5	—	Ophthalmia	31	30
Amenorrhœa and Chlorosis	90	89	Endocarditis	29	29
Ascites	14	10	Pericarditis	2	2
Diarrhœa	114	122	Enteritis	6	1
Dysentery	44	42	Pneumonia	300	280
Erysipelas of the face	181	177	Peritonitis	105	100
Fever, excluding typhus	1036	1007	Pleuritis	224	221
Typhus, abdominalis	819	669	Measles	25	23
Influenza	52	51	Phthisis	98	—
Dyspeptic affections	173	172	Rheumatism, acute & chronic	188	188
Gout, acute and chronic	102	97	Scarlatina	35	31
Headaches, various	61	61	Small-pox	136	120
Articular inflammations	211	203	Tonsillitis	300	299

No candid physician, looking at the original report, or at the small part of it which we have extracted, will hesitate to acknowledge that the results there set forth would have been considered by him as satisfactory, if they had occurred in his own practice. The amount of deaths in the fevers and eruptive diseases is certainly below the ordinary proportion.

For further information of private and official reports, we refer the reader to the statistics Homœopathic treatment given in a popular view of *Homœopathia*, by Rev. TH. R. EVEREST, with annotations, &c., by A. GERARD HULL, M. D., New York, 1842; where will be seen that

The Homœopathic proportions of deaths were as - - - 2 to 49.

The Allopathic proportions of deaths were as - - - 5 to 7.

Le Moniteur, the official organ of the French Government, thus refers to the distinction conferred on Dr. MABIT, in consequence of his successful Homœopathic treatment of Cholera at Bordeaux, and also for having founded a Homœopathic Hospital, the results of which were sufficiently striking to command the attention of the *French Sovereign*:

"Dr. MABIT has been created "Knight of the *Legion of Honor*;" a recompense rendered to his devotions and exertions on the appearance of the Asiatic cholera, as well as to his steadfast zeal and continued researches for the interests of humanity and progress of medicine."

For further proofs of the success of Homœopathia in *Cholera Asiatica*, see the article of Francis Black, M. D., Edinburgh, in the British Journal of Homœopathia, as an extract from Dr. Quin's "*Traitemt Homœopathique du Cholera*." On Dr. Quin's leaving Tischnowitz in Moravia, a letter of thanks was written to him by the magistrates, expressive of their gratitude for his services.

In the statement of Dr. Brenfleck, on *Typhus*, dated Wisloch, 6th June, 1842, (*Hygœa*, vol. xlvii,) which in consequence of an order from the Grand Ducal Board of Health, was drawn up as a report of a course and treatment of the disease raging there, we see from the list of 29 patients, whom Dr. Brenfleck attended Homœopathically, only two died, one being a female of a weak frame of body, whose health had been bad for many years, and the other a girl of fifteen, who had been given over to Allopathic treatment, after being only four days under Dr. Brenfleck's care.

And finally a sample of Dr. HAHNEMANN's own practice. After the battle of Leipzig, 16-18 October, 1813, a most fatal *typhus fever* raged; in which, out of *one hundred and eighty* patients, which Hahnemann himself treated, *all* had been restored to health except *one*.

In our own country wherever the two practices have been compared, the same or similar results have been obtained. In New York, New Orleans, Cincinnati and St. Louis, the proportion of deaths in Cholera range from 2 to 5 per cent. treated Homœopathically, to from 30 to 60 per cent. under Allopathic treatment. In 1849 when the Cholera was raging in Cincinnati, while the old school lost from 30 to 50 per cent. in the aggregate, the Homœopathic treatment exhibited a loss of only $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and although at the close of the epidemic when the Allopathic's called a meeting of the profession and appointed a Committee of twelve to collect statistics of the relative practice under Allopathic, Eclectic and Homœopathic treatment, with a view to expose the falsity of the Homœopathic bulletins claiming only the loss of two or three per cent., after a careful investigation during the period

of six weeks they were unable to find a single death under Homœopathic treatment not admitted by the Homœopathic physicians in their previous statements. The consequence was, they, thinking "silence" the best policy, never attempted to refute the statements of Homœopathists previously made, and no successful refutation ever was attempted thereafter. In Louisville, although the Cholera was confined almost exclusively to certain locations during the summer of 1850-1, and treated mostly by Allopathic physicians, still wherever a case was treated *ab initio* by Homœopathic physicians, the results were the same as above quoted. Indeed, during the first forty-eight hours the Allopathics lost every patient, and one of the most eminent of the faculty in dismay at his want of success, declared "that he never wanted to see another case of Cholera, for *he could do nothing* for them."

Such have been the triumphs of Homœopathy wherever introduced, and such the fondness with which its friends who know it best and have most frequently tested its value in disease cling to it, that it is no wonder the Allopathic school begin every where to exclaim: "they take from us our best families and they *keep them too.*"

Below we give the testimonials of a few of the most distinguished individuals who have practiced both systems, that the public may know that all the science, nor all the truth cannot be found in defence of the exploded notions of the Antiquarian school. Of the converts from Allopathia, Homœopathia now numbers over 2,500.

Dr. SCHULER, an eminent Allopathic physician of Stollberg, says:—"During a quarter of a century I had followed the banner of Allopathia. I had employed much time and money in studying its frequent transformations, without finding a thread which could guide me in the labyrinth of medicine, without power to unravel the mystery by which cures are effected. It is assuredly to our ignorance of the virtues of medicines and of the proper mode of using them, that we must attribute, the ravages of disease.

These thoughts besieged my mind and embarrassed my views, in spite of my attention to the letter of the law prescribed by the masters of the art, and I was forced to quit the beaten track and follow an unknown path. But in wishing to avoid one rock, I fell upon another. That I might escape from this perplexity, I had for a long time devoted much attention to Homœopathia, but the cry of reprobation which rose against it, and the apparent paradox of many of its principles, especially that of the infinitely small doses, turned me from the study of it and retained me a faithful adherent to the old method. But my doubts and my fidelity were finally strongly shaken, and it was *experience* which produced these effects."

J. A. H. MUHLENBEIN, M. D., Privy and State Counsellor, Physician to the Duke of Brunswick, and Knight of the Order of the Guelf: "I have been a doctor in medicine for fifty years, during the first thirty-three of which I practised Allopathically and with success, if I may presume to judge by the public reputation conferred upon me; but I assure you that I owe daily oblations to my Creator for an allowance of sufficient years to become convinced of the Homœopathic truth. Indeed, it is only since I have practised Homœopathia, that I have been satisfied of the utility of any system of medicine, and have acquired information by which I could repair errors I committed in Allopathic practice from want of *absolute* knowledge. These are my views of Homœopathia, which I communicated

sometime since through *Stapf's Archives*; but having nearly attained the limits of my existence, I reiterate to you, that I am more than ever convinced, that Homœopathia is the only true mode of restoring the sick to health, and that permanent health."

M. CROSERIO, Doctor of Medicine, President of the Homœopathic Society of Paris, and Physician to the Sardinian Embassy in the French Capitol, &c: "The study and practice of the old system for thirty years have enabled me to judge of its merits and defects, and it was only after a profound conviction, derived from a knowledge of both doctrines, that I have recognized the importance of the Hahnemannean system. Several years of experience in its practical application have served only to confirm my convictions of its merit; this circumstance, together with the well-known fact, that no practitioner, who has within thirty years adopted it, ever returned to the old system, the principles of which appear truly a paltry absurdity to one who has been practising for some time on the clear and rational precepts of Homœopathia, are pretty favorable arguments of its real value. The tacit contract, made by every physician, embracing Homœopathia, to contribute with all his power to its propagation, encourages me in the painful task of publishing the falsity of my creed during the space of thirty years.

JAMES KITCHEN, M. D., of Philadelphia, asserts he had been, before embracing Homœopathia, a practitioner of the old school for fifteen years, during which space of time he had seen considerable practice and considered himself fully qualified to know what disease was, and to appreciate the effects of remedies,—in addition he may say, that he had received the best medical education, both in this country and in Europe, and had studied under the most celebrated professors, and attended the different Hospitals in those places where he studied: these remarks are made not by way of boast or an exhibition of superior qualifications, but merely for the purpose of allowing himself to think, that he was fully qualified to appreciate the effects of Homœopathic remedies on disease, and to form a correct judgment as to their sanative nature. These sanative effects he was first made aware of in his own person, and afterwards in a short space of time, in several well marked instances among his patients, insomuch that he soon became fully convinced of the efficacy of the doses, though he must confess, at first considerably prejudiced against such a conviction,—but these instances were so numerous and so palpable, that he was forced to acknowledge them as correct, and now, at this present time, after a lapse of nearly three years, his conviction is still more forcible.

Dr. G. HULL, of New York, observes: "So far as our individual testimony may influence others, we are ready to state, that our convictions of the truth of the Homeopathic law have been additionally strengthened by personal intercourse with Hahnemann—travelling over the European ground of its occupation—learning the reputation of its adherents—inspecting its archives—perusing the essential pages of the principal works of its literature; and, finally, we would humbly affirm, that we have made full and impartial trials of the system in practice during the last twelve years, and, whether it was applied to sleeping or unconscious infancy, ripened manhood, or the tottering decrepitude of old age—whether aimed at the imminent dangers of acute sickness, or the insidious devastations of chronic maladies, that the general results invariably and irresistibly converged to one conclu-

sion—the confirmation of the principle, *similia similibus curantur*, as one of the immutable laws of nature."

We shall close these sheets by introducing the testimony of a few distinguished names to the high and lofty character which was attained by the founder of Homœopathy among his cotemporaries, although it is presumed that the charge of empiricism and quackery will not again soon be made against the propagators of the new science. The tables are fast turning, and very soon popular opinion will compel those who practice the healing art to adopt and practice according to the system of *similia similibus curantur*, or seek a livelihood in some more congenial occupation.

HUFELAND, the venerable Patriarch of GERMAN Allopathia, has conceded the existence of merit to the system of Hahnemann, whose first essay on Homœopathia was published in his Medical Journal 1796, and for whom he acknowledged the highest personal respect. In his Journal for 1826 he says: Hahnemann is a man to whom we must concede our respect, and Homœopathia is advancing in importance. That Hahnemann deserves this, cannot well be denied, especially by the writer of this article, who has been united to him, by the ties of friendship, for more than thirty years, having always esteemed him as one of our most distinguished, intelligent and original physicians. Is it necessary to allude to our obligations to him for his discoveries of the *Wine test*; *Mercurius solubilis*—in my opinion the most effective preparation of mercury,—the preservative against *Scarlatina* and many others, and also to his various writings, and for the abundant proofs he has given of a philosophical mind and keen powers of investigation? Homœopathia seems to me particularly valuable in two points of view; first, because it promises to lead the art of healing back to the only true path of quiet observation and experience, and gives new life to the too much neglected worth of symptomatology; and secondly, because it furnishes simplicity in the treatment of disease. I first was induced to notice Homœopathia, because I deemed it *undignified*, to treat the new system with ridicule and contempt. Besides I had a long time esteemed its author for his earlier productions, and for his sterling contributions to the science of medicine; and I had also observed the names of several respectable men, who, in no way blinded by prejudice, had recognized the facts of Homœopathic science as true.

KOPP, distinguished for his writings on legal and practical medicine, discourses so of Hahnemann: Whoever has traced Hahnemann's career with a critical eye, whether as an author, teacher, or founder, and master of a new school, must be struck with his genius for investigation, originality of reflection and gigantic powers of mind. It unites wisdom and a knowledge of mankind to the highest order of talent, and aims to accomplish his purpose with profound learning and unremitting perseverance; he strives with patient confidence to perfect his plans by the aid of the vast fund of knowledge which he has spent so many years in accumulating.

Throughout all his work we detect the studious and faithful experimenter in chemistry of the early days of that science. His researches respecting the scientific virtue of medicine, and respecting the amount of susceptibility in the human organism to their impressions, are of imperishable importance to our art. It is very certain that Hahnemann has met the most

implacable opposition to his system among more medical men *who have not practised it, nor even studied it.*

FRANCE.—*Broussais*, the founder and champion of the celebrated doctrine physiologique, that has produced such a marked revolution in the practice of medicine advised in his public lectures, delivered in the Ecole de Medicine, at Paris, that impartial trials should be made before *Homœopathia* was judged or condemned, concluding his address with words that are honorable to his candor and philanthropy: “I do not reject an opinion because it may be opposed to my former convictions, they may call it ridiculous or extravagant. I never laugh about it! *Many distinguished persons are occupied with it; we cannot reject it without a hearing; we must investigate the truth it contains.*”

ITALY.—*Brera*, who holds a distinguished rank among the Allopathists of Italy in his *Anthologia Medica* writes: *Homœopathia* is decried by some as useless and by others as strange, and though it appears to the great majority as ridiculous and extraordinary, it can nevertheless not be denied, that it has taken its stand in the scientific world; like every other doctrine; it has its books, its journals, its chairs, its hospitals, clinical lectures, professors and most respectable communities to hear and to appreciate. *Nolens volens*, even its enemies must receive it in the history of medicine, for its present situation requires it. Having attained this rank it deserves by no means contempt, but on the contrary a cool and impartial investigation, like all other systems of modern date. *Homœopathia* is the more respected, as it propagates no directly noxious errors. If it proclaims facts and theories which cannot be reconciled with our present knowledge, this is no sufficient cause, as yet, to despise it and rank it among obsolete falsities. Woe to the physician, who believes that he cannot learn to-morrow, what he does not know to-day. Do we not hear daily complaints of the insufficiency of the healing art? and are not those physicians, who honestly suspect the solidity of their knowledge, the most learned, and, in their practice the most successful? Such sentiments have undoubtedly induced most of the German physicians to study *Homœopathia*, and to conquer their aversion to the new doctrine. Let us always recollect that the greatest discoveries have given origin to the most violent controversies. Witness the examples of *Harvey, Galileo, Newton, Descartes, &c.*

ENGLAND.—*Dr. J. G. Millingen*, Surgeon to the British forces and highly esteemed Allopathic practitioner; author of the *Curiosities of Medical Science*: The mere hopes of being able to relieve society from the curse of constant drugging should lead us to hail with gratitude the *Homœopathist's* investigations. That many physicians, but especially apothecaries, who live by overwhelming their patients with useless and too frequently pernicious medicines, will warmly, nay furiously inveigh against any innovation of the kind, must be expected as the natural result of interested apprehension; and any man who aims at simplicity in practice will be denounced as guilty of medical heresy. Have we not seen inoculation and vaccination branded with the most opprobrious epithets, merely because their introduction tended to diminish professional lucre? Facts which induced me, from having been one of the warmest opponents of this (the *Homœopathic*) system, to

investigate carefully and dispassionately its practical points,—will contradict all the assertions regarding the inefficacy of the Homœopathic doses, the influence of diet, or the agency of the mind; for in the following cases (vide his curiosities) in no one instance could such influences be brought into action. They were (with scarcely any exception) experiments made without the patient's knowledge and where no time was allowed for any particular regimen. *They may, moreover, be conscientiously relied upon, since they were made with a view to prove the fallacy of the Homœopathic practice.* I could record many instances of similar results, but of course they would be foreign to the nature of this work. *I trust that the few cases I have related, will afford a convincing proof of the injustice, if not the unjustifiable obstinacy, of those practitioners, who, refusing to submit the Homœopathic practice to a fair trial, condemn it without investigation.* It is possible, nay, more than probable, that physicians cannot find time to commence a new course of studies, for such this investigation must prove. If this is the case, let them frankly avow their utter ignorance of the doctrine, and not denounce with merciless tyranny, a practice, of which they do not possess the slightest knowledge.

AMERICA.—*Valentine Mott*, justly the pride of American Surgery, imbued with the becoming liberality of an unprejudiced and noble mind, visited *Hahnemann* during his first sojourn in Europe. Instead of denouncing this venerable philosopher as the conceptionist of a puerile and useless theory, he has had the moral courage to speak of the Master Spirit of modern medical history in the following language:—“*Hahnemann is one of the most accomplished and scientific physicians of the present age.*”

Finally, we would advise all into whose hands these sheets may fall, to reflect upon the subject. Homœopathy proposes much—has accomplished much. It cures disease according to certain and fixed laws—laws that have been indistinctly seen and partially acknowledged by the profession from the time of Hippocrates to the present moment, but which were reserved for their full elimination to the illustrious *Hahnemann*, the founder of Homœopathia, and his followers. Thousands are now reaping the blessings of these discoveries, and the time is not distant when its truths will be universally recognized and practised, as the only true and reliable system.



THOS. J. GRIFFITHS, M.D.

HOMEOPATHIST.

OFFICE & RESIDENCE,

South side of Green St., 3 doors below Tenth,

LOUISVILLE, KY.



Wm. F. Murphy, Printer & Stationer, 26 South Third Street, Philadelphia.